

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending. Claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Kori (US Patent No. 5,914,754). In light of the arguments contained herein, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device that includes:

ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device;

buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker; and

displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker. *Emphasis added.*

Although of a different scope than claim 1, claims 9 and 24 also recite a step of “buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker.”

Similarly, independent claim 12 is directed to a display device for displaying a video feed that includes:

a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions;

a parser configured to parse at least one marker from the video feed, the at least one marker defining a region of a frame of the video feed, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display area;

a buffer configured to selectively store rows of the region defined by the at least one marker; and

a video controller configured to display, in the display area, the buffered rows. *Emphasis added.*

Although of a different scope than claim 12, claim 9 similarly recites a step of “parsing at least one marker from the video feed.”

Independent claim 16 is directed to a display device for displaying a video feed that includes:

- a display area having horizontal and vertical resolutions;
- means for ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device;
- a buffer;
- means for storing in the buffer at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker; and
- means for displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker. *Emphasis added.*

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion (Office Action, page 2), the Kori reference does not teach or suggest 1) "buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker," as recited in claims 1, 9 and 24; 2) "a buffer configured to selectively store rows of the region defined by the at least one marker," as recited in claim 12; or 3) a "means for storing in the buffer at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker," as recited in claim 16. Moreover, contrary to the Examiner's assertion (Office action, pages 2-3), the Kori reference does not teach or suggest a parser, a step of parsing, or means for parsing as recited in independent claims 9 and 12, and dependent claims 2, 3, 17, 18, 25, and 26.

Rather, Kori is directed to a video signal aspect ratio conversion apparatus having an aspect converter using line memories to store a video signal and a video ID decoder to supply aspect ratio information. Figure 3a; column 5, lines 48-50; column 4, lines 21-24. The Examiner states that Kori's disclosure of the line memories anticipates a buffer/buffering step as recited by claims 1, 9, 12, 16, and 24 (Office Action, page 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Kori fails to disclose buffering or storing rows in the

“region defined by the at least one marker.” At most, Kori discloses separating a video signal into a digitized luminance signal and a digitized color difference signal, sampling both signals, and then storing the signals in one of the line memories. Column 5, lines 8-25. Then, “the aspect ratio of the stored digital video picture is converted... by outputting a partial area of the digital video picture from line memories 15 and 16 with the desired aspect ratio.” Column 5, lines 52-56. Later, Kori discloses a step of “reconstruct[ing] the video signal with the output aspect ratio from the samples stored in the line memory circuits 15 and 16.” Column 6, lines 14-16. In other words, Kori merely discloses storing an unconverted video signal in the line memories, and then converting the signal to the desired aspect ratio. Such a disclosure fails to anticipate buffering or storing rows in the “region defined by the at least one marker.”

In addition, the Examiner states that Kori’s disclosure of the video ID decoder and Figure 12a anticipates a parser, a step of parsing, or means for parsing as recited in independent claims 9 and 12, and dependent claims 2, 3, 17, 18, 25, and 26 (Office Action, pages 2-3). Applicant respectfully disagrees. At most, Kori discloses that the video ID decoder “decodes the identification signal included in the vertical blanking section of the video signal and supplies the aspect ratio information to the microcomputer 5.” Column 4, lines 21-24. Figure 12a merely illustrates a bit allocation map. Kori’s disclosure of a the video ID decoder and the bit allocation map fails to teach or suggest a parser, a step of parsing, or means for parsing as recited in independent claims 9 and 12, or dependent claims 2, 3, 17, 18, 25, and 26.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claims 1, 9, 12, 16, and 24 be withdrawn. Moreover, claims 2-8, 10-11, 13-18, 20-23, and 25-31 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 9, 12, 16, or 24, and should be allowed for at least the same reason.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes any fee due has been addressed in the accompanying transmittal charging Deposit Account No. 08-2025, under Order No. 200309213-1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged to such deposit account number.

Dated: May 27, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shelly L. Hokenstad/
Shelly L. Hokenstad
Registration No.: 59,107
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
39533 Woodward Avenue, Suite 140
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304
(248) 594-0636
Attorney for Applicant